APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/613,104	07/07/2003	Feihong Chen	129250-001017/US	4241

32498   7590   10/01/2008
CAPITOL PATENT & TRADEMARK LAW FIRM, PLLC
P.O. BOX 1995
VIENNA, VA 22183

EXAMINER
RUSSELL, WANDA Z

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2616	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
10/01/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1.   Applicant's arguments, filed 9/11/2008, have been fully considered but are not

persuasive.

2.   Regarding **claim 1**, Applicant argues that there is not disclosure within Enoki that

the "LSR 3" router is capable of independently ("by itself") generating a backward path.

        In response, the Examiner respectfully disagrees.

        As the Examiner stated obviously. Also refer to Fig. 15, it can be seen that the.

        If the statement in last office action, "transmit" involves "generate" and S26 is

generated by LSR3 shown in Fig. 15 of Enoki, is not convincing enough, see the

paragraph by Enoki below:

[0037] Also, when receiving the bidirectional LSP setup label request message
transmitted by the LSR 100 at the other end, the bidirectional LSP setup TLV
analyzer 31 at the LSR 200 analyzes the bidirectional LSP setup TLV in the
message, so that the bidirectional **LSP processor 61 makes the LSP setup request
in the down direction as opposed to the up direction** based on the analyzed
result by the bidirectional LSP setup TLV analyzer 31.

Note that the LSP processor mentioned above is located in 100 LSP of Fig. 1 that is the

same as all LSR 1, 2, and 3 in Fig. 15. The "make" stated above is "generating".

3.   Regarding **claim 2,** Applicant argues that the device by So is not in the receiving.

        In response, the Examiner respectfully disagrees.

        From either Fig. 1 of So or Fig. 15 of Enoki, all the routers in the transmitting side

or receiving side are the same. And, the para. [0374] by So teaches "point to point

connection", and "LSP provides a parameterized packet forwarding path".

4.   Regarding **claims 5-6,** the arguments are the same as for claim 2.

5.   Regarding **claim 7,** the argument is the same as for claim 1.

6.   Regarding **claim 13,** Applicant argues that So does not suggest any such

originates the claimed network device.

In response, the Examiner respectfully disagrees.

So teaches in [0230] that "**If no wavelength conversion is used** in the network

and **on the client/network interface,** then the **same wavelength will be required** for

the primary and restoration lightpaths if the client cannot retune its wavelength on

failure. Whether or not the client can provide this re-tuning can be **passed as a**

parameter in the lightpath request".

The claim does not have the language of functional details of the "parameters",

and the process is taught by the paragraph [0230] of So.

7.   Regarding **claims 14-16,** Applicant argues that So is directed at the deletion of

light paths.

In response, the Examiner respectfully disagrees.

So teaches:

[0572] The process of establishing a bidirectional LSP follows the
establishment of a unidirectional LSP with some additions. To support
bi-directional LSPs an Upstream Label is added to the Path/REQUEST message.
The Upstream Label MUST indicate a label that is valid for forwarding at the time the
Path/REQUEST message is sent. When a Path/REQUEST message containing
an Upstream Label is received, the receiver first verifies that the upstream
label is acceptable. If the label is not acceptable, the receiver MUST issue a
PathErr/NOTIFICATION message with a "Routing problem/Unacceptable label value"
indication. An intermediate node must also allocate a label on the outgoing
interface and establish internal data paths before filling in an outgoing Upstream Label
and propagating the Path/REQUEST message. If an intermediate node is unable to
allocate a label or internal resources, then it MUST issue a PathErr/NOTIFICATION
message with a "Routing problem/Label allocation failure" indication. Terminator
nodes process Path/REQUEST messages as usual, with the exception that the

upstream label can immediately be used to transport associated data upstream to the initiator. **When a bi-directional LSP is removed**, both upstream and downstream labels are invalidated and it is no longer valid to send data using the associated labels.

The "remove" is delete as claimed, and all the details in this paragraph teach all the elements in claims 14-16.

8.   Regarding **claims 17, 18, 20-22, 23-26, 31-48, and 53-56,** the examiner once

again incorporate the discussion above with respect to the applicability of So and Enoki

to the claims.

/Wanda Z Russell/
Examiner, Art Unit 2616